

# Educators' Perspectives towards Inclusion of Students with Mild to Moderate Disabilities into the General Education Classroom

Felipe M. Landicho

Cebu Technological University-Moalboal Campus, Cebu, Philippines

## ABSTRACT

This research deals with the perception of teachers and administrators in the inclusion of children with mild to moderate disabilities to general education classroom. General education and special education teachers together with administrators were surveyed to gather data for this quantitative study. The Inclusive School Program survey by McLesky et al. (2001) and four-point Likert scale were used in the collection of data. The respondents also responded to open-ended questions in order to determine what training approach is most helpful and least beneficial. There was a low correlation between the perspective of educators and the variables, age and educational level, towards inclusive education. However, there was no significant correlation between educators' perspectives and gender and race profile in relation to inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities to general education. The researcher concluded that based on the assessment of educators' perspectives, a proposed plan would be administered to enhance educator's perspectives towards inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities into the general education classroom. It is recommended that professional development training for general education teachers should be conducted for them to be effective and efficient.

**KEYWORDS:** *Educators' Perspective; Inclusive Education; General Education Classroom*

## INTRODUCTION

Millions of school-age students in K-12 education systems around the world are seen as "different" from their non-disabled peers. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES 2016), during the academic year 2015-16, seven million kids were provided services for special education under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 2004), accounting for 13% of total school enrolment in public schools (Nowicki, 2019). Behavior problems, cognitive problems, giftedness, sensory impairment, specific learning disabilities, intellectual impairment, and learning challenges may be present in all these students. Accordingly, Students with Disabilities (SWDs) must have equal access to the general education as other students, according to a contemporary trend in inclusive education (Olson et al., 2016).

This is also in line with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, that gender disparity be eliminated and equal access to education be ensured at all levels of vocational training and education and

**How to cite this paper:** Felipe M. Landicho "Educators' Perspectives towards Inclusion of Students with Mild to Moderate Disabilities into the General Education Classroom" Published in International

Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (ijtsrd), ISSN: 2456-6470,

Volume-6 | Issue-6, October 2022,

pp.233-244,

www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd51812.pdf



Copyright © 2022 by author(s) and International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development Journal. This is an Open Access article distributed under the



terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)

for the susceptible group, including persons with special needs, children in vulnerable situations, and indigenous people. Everyone, regardless of nationality, ethnicity, gender, color, age, language, spiritual and political beliefs, societal origin, ownership, or birth, physical condition, migrants, indigenous group, and youth and children, particularly those in vulnerable situations, must have access to equitable, inclusive quality education, and opportunities for lifelong learning.

In the past, a research about students with mild to moderate disabilities was so limited especially when they refer to inclusion in the general education setting. Those studies intended to broaden the scope of research on the perspectives of both teachers in general and special education, in order to implement an action plan to address the issue at the school level as well as to the district level (Zigmond, 2003).

Given that one of the most essential factors in the effectiveness of inclusive education is the attitude and

willingness of the educators to cater the needs of students with exceptional needs, it is critical to find out about educator's attitudes toward inclusion. This is crucial since the effectiveness of the inclusive education paradigm is heavily influenced by one's attitude. Given the scarcity of data on teachers' attitudes toward inclusion in educational settings, this study will contribute to the process of inclusion in such a setting.

## OBJECTIVES

This research assessed the attitudes and challenges of teachers in general education classrooms towards the inclusion of students with disabilities of mild to moderate level at Desert Pines High School, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA during the school year 2022-2023.

The specific objectives are the following:

1. determine the demographic profile of the teachers and school administrators;
2. assess the extent of attitudes of educators in general education towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities in their classrooms in terms of student background, peer support, administrative support, collaboration, and training;
3. determine the type of delivery method is most beneficial in receiving training regarding inclusion of special education students in the classroom;
4. establish the significant difference between and among the ratings of the respondent groups on the educator's attitudes towards inclusion based on each of the aforementioned variables; and
5. Determine the significant correlation between the respondent groups' attitudes towards inclusion and each of their demographic profiles.

## METHODOLOGY

### Design

This research used a correlational quantitative approach. The study of the educators towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities in their general education setting utilized the qualitative method by firstly, identifying the basic background of the respondents, determining their attitudes using the checklist and identifying the demographic profile

The qualitative method is based on the perspective of administrators and special education teachers, while the quantitative method is reflected by the use of adaptive survey questionnaires focusing on determining the perspectives or attitudes of different

educators and administrators to answer the questions on their respective perspectives on inclusion.

The mixed method was the most effective and appropriate method in finding out what significant factors affect to the educators towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities in their general education classrooms.

### Research Flow

This study was composed of three major categories: input, process, and output. The input comprised the respondents' demographic profile by the teacher and administrators as to their age and gender, nationality, level of educational attainment, length of teaching experience, and current position. It included the respondents' attitudes towards inclusive education comprising student background, peer support, administrative support, collaboration and training. The input also included the type of delivery method of the respondents in terms of receiving training regarding inclusion of special education students in the classroom and the significant difference between and among the ratings of the respondent groups on the educator's attitudes towards inclusion with basis from the stated variables.

The process contained the approval of the transmittal letter for data gathering and the collection, tabulation, computation and the analysis of the data.

The output of the study was a: training design for teachers to enhance knowledge and skills about the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities in general education classroom setting.

### Research Environment

The study was conducted at Desert Pines High School is located in 3800 Harris Ave., Las Vegas, Nevada, USA, which belong to Clark County School District (CCSD). Previously, Desert Pines High School was one of the turnaround institutions, but now considered as one of the magnet schools. Moreover, it is one of the inner-city schools with challenges such as overcrowding and one hundred percent free and reduced lunch student population in Clark County School District. Figure 3 shows the location of the Desert Pines High School, the locale of the study.

### Respondents

The respondents for this study are the teachers and school administrators at Desert Pines High School, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA. There were 90 teachers chosen through random sampling as respondents and 10 school administrators who were also randomly picked to be respondents of the study. There was a total of 100 respondents used in this study with a percentage of one hundred percent (100%).

**Table 1: Distribution of the Respondents**

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage
Teachers	90	90
School Administrators	10	10
Total	100	100%

### Research Instrument

This research used Survey Monkey program, with 42-item questions developed by McLeskey et al., (2001). Each of the items on the Likert-type scale included the four rating options of Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

The survey consisted of eight (8) questions about demographics regarding (a) gender (b) nationality, (c) age (d) educational level, (e) length of teaching experience at high school level, (f) total number of teaching experience, (g) number of courses received in teaching special education children, and (h) amount of experience with teaching special education children.

The study was grounded on descriptive statistics and qualitative analysis. The outcomes of the quantitative data were used to conduct quantitative analyses. The frequency and correlations were also investigated. Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) were applied to identify the relationships between the independent variables on age and gender, nationality, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, and present position held. The subdomains were Student Background, Peer Support, Administrative Support, Collaboration, and Training. At the end of the survey instrument, the respondents responded to open-ended question to determine the most helpful and least beneficial training approaches for achieving inclusion training.

### Statistical Treatment of Data

A combination of descriptive and inferential statistical tools was applied to appropriately present, describe, analyze and infer the collected data from the respondents through survey questionnaires.

Frequency distribution was used to present and describe the profile of the respondents. Percentages of each of the respondents' profile was calculated to describe them quantitatively and generally. Composite Mean was calculated to determine the extent of attitudes of educators in general education towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities in their classrooms in terms of student background, peer support, administrative support, collaboration and training. Composite Mean was calculated again to determine the type of delivery method that is beneficial in receiving training regarding including special education students in the classroom. One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

was considered to test the significant difference among the ratings of the three groups of respondents on the general education teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion based on each of the aforementioned variables (student background, peer support, administrative support, collaboration and training). Chi-square was considered to test the significant correlation between the profile of the respondents and the general education teachers' attitudes towards inclusion.

### Scoring Procedure

To determine the degree of perception of the respondents with mild to moderate disability in the general education classroom, the scoring procedure below was used as the basis for describing the composite mean.

Range	Description	Verbal Description
3.25 - 4.00	Strongly Agree	Strongly agrees on the inclusion of learners with mild to moderate disability in general education settings.
2.50 - 3.24	Agree	Agrees on inclusion of learners with mild to moderate disability in general education settings.
1.75 - 2.49	Disagree	Disagrees on inclusion of learners with mild to moderate disability in general education settings.
1.00 - 1.74	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagrees on inclusion of learners with mild to moderate disability in general education settings.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Teachers' Profile

This section gives the respondents' profile who are teachers in terms of their age, gender, nationality, educational attainment, length of teaching experience and present position held. The following table shows the consolidated data of the profile of the Respondent Teachers.

**Age Profile.** The data in Table 2 concerning the age of the respondents showed the age group 25 – 35 had the greatest number of teachers counting as nineteen teachers. It was followed by 16 teachers in 36 – 45 age group. There were only 1 teacher who was below 25 of age. This inferred that young and vigorous teachers were in the school system and were capable of assessing and assisting the needs of learners with disabilities.

The study of Bodhe and Jankar (2015) resulted to students preferring younger teachers and they are innovative. They could very well make use of audio-visual aids and other techniques for improving their teaching capabilities. However, senior teachers were also given appreciation as experiences were considered especially in the field of teaching as it is said that the experience increased as the age advanced.

**Table 2 Profile of Teachers**

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Age</b>		
55 & above	14	15.56
46 to 55	15	16.67
36 to 45	30	33.33
25 to 35	29	32.22
Below 25	2	2.22
Total	90	100.00
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	36	40.00
Female	54	60.00
Total	90	100.00
<b>Nationality</b>		
White	55	61.11
Asian	16	17.78
Other	9	10.00
Black or African	6	6.67
American Indian	2	2.22
Prefer not to say	2	2.22
Total	90	100.00
<b>Highest Educational Attainment</b>		
Bachelors	15	16.67
Bachelors +15	5	5.56
Bachelors +30	14	15.56
Masters	17	18.89
Masters +15	8	8.89
Masters +30	24	26.67
Doctoral	7	7.78
Total	90	100.00
<b>Length of Teaching Experience</b>		
26 years and up	8	8.89
21 to 25 years	11	12.22
16 to 20 years	10	11.11
11 to 15 years	13	14.44
6 to 10 years	22	24.44
1 to 5 years	26	28.89
Total	90	100.00
<b>Position Held</b>		
General Education	80	88.89
Special Education	10	11.11
Total	90	100.00

**Gender Profile.** The dominant group in terms of gender was female teachers. There were fifty-four females and only thirty-six males as group of teacher respondents. This showed that there was empathic listening, better understanding and view of concern in a classroom setting for there were many female teachers (Feldman, 1993 as cited by Young, et al., 2009) However, the study of Bodhe et al. (2015) found out the students do not matter the gender of the teacher in the classroom. What matters is how the teacher conduct himself in the class in terms of physical A well dressed, clean and neat teacher produces good first impression and facilitates further process of learning.

**Nationality Profile.** The nationality profile of the respondent teachers was shown in the same Table 2. Out of ninety teachers, majority of the respondents are White with fifty-five (55) teachers. There were sixteen Asian teachers chosen as respondents. Other races were nine and six teachers were Black or African. There were couple of American Indian and those teachers who prefer not to say about their nationality. The implication of this was that while the respondents are predominantly White, the demographics is diverse in terms of nationality.

Markus (2008) emphasized the importance of teachers having an improved understanding of students of color. There was a connection to classroom learning settings as each student has unique characteristics that can be cultivated. The disparities that exist in connection to gaps for students of color can be addressed by means of the improved strategies and policy decisions in the state.

**Highest Educational Attainment Profile.** The highest educational attainment profile of the respondent teachers is displayed in Table 2. Majority of the respondent teachers have Master's degree with 30 more credit units. Seventeen teachers have Master's degree and fifteen teachers have Bachelor's degree. There were fourteen teacher who have Bachelor's degree with 30 more credit units and eight of them have Master's degree with 15 more credit units. There were seven teachers who had taken Doctoral degree.

The result indicates that most of the respondents have pursued beyond their Master's degree by taking more courses/subjects onwards to upgrading their professional qualifications.

According to Wenglinisky (2002), a teacher cannot be determined to be qualified by checking his or her educational level. Although important, teacher education level and experience only represent a portion of the ability to handle the classroom

efficiently and to promote achievement of the students.

**Length of Teaching Experience Profile.** The length of teaching experience of the respondent teachers is displayed in Table 2. Majority of the respondents have 1 to 5 years of experience, having a frequency of 26 or 28.89 percent. There were twenty-two (22) teachers with 6 – 1 years of experience and thirteen teachers had 11 – 15 years of experience. Teachers with 21 – 25 years of experience were eleven, one greater than those teachers with 16 – 20 years. There were only eight teacher who were 26 years or more in the service. This data implied that there are more respondents who are new to teaching than veterans.

Greenberg et al. (2004) defined teacher experience as the number of years a teacher has taught. It is a subject of concern to policymakers since experienced teachers were given more opportunities to teach higher level or advanced classes resulting to higher achievement in the classroom. Thus, it is possible that the poor performance of the students was linked to teachers with less experience.

**Position Held Profile.** The position profile of the teacher's respondents is displayed in Table 2. Among the respondent teachers, eighty (80) teachers were in general education program, while ten were special education teachers. This implies the distribution of the type of teachers of which general education teachers were majority.

The study of Charley (2015) resulted to more positive attitude of special education teachers in regards to inclusion than those of general education teachers. However, the self-efficacy of all the respondents were on higher level implying an implementation of training to improve inclusive practices and strategies which might ultimately improve student outcomes.

### Administrators' Profile

This subsection shows the respondents administrators' profile in terms of their age, gender, nationality, educational attainment, and length of experience.

**Table 3 Profiles of Administrators**

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Age</b>		
55 & above	1	10.00
46 to 55	4	40.00
36 to 45	4	40.00
25 to 35	1	10.00
Total	10	100.00
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	6	60.00
Female	4	40.00
Total	10	100.00

<b>Nationality</b>		
White	6	60.00
Asian	1	10.00
Other	2	20.00
Black or African	1	10.00
Total	10	100.00
<b>Highest Educational Attainment</b>		
Masters	1	10.00
Masters +30	3	30.00
Doctoral	6	60.00
Total	10	100.00
<b>Length of Administrative Experience</b>		
11 to 15 years	2	20.00
6 to 10 years	7	70.00
1 to 5 years	1	10.00
Total	10	100.00

**Age Profile.** Table 3 displays the age profile of the respondents. There were 4 administrators who were both in 36 – 45 and 46 – 55 age brackets. Only one administrator belonged to age brackets of 25 – 35 and 55 above.

Ukpong (2002) studied age of administrators and intellectual functioning after the age of 40 years and found out that there was a steady decrease in intellectual ability after 60 years. However, administrators who kept their physicality well and continued to exercise their intellectual aspect by engaging themselves in stimulating activities showed little decline in intellectual ability up to the age of 70 years.

**Gender Profile.** Most of the administrators were males with 60 percent. The female respondents have a frequency of 4 or 40 percent. This suggests that majority of the Administrators are males who belong to Generation X, born within 1965-1980, and Millennials, born between 1981-1996.

Stigliano (2021) specified that one of the many roles of a building administrator is to foster elements and create an organizational structure that is built around strong relationships. The teachers and staff's support and trust within the institution is imperative. The gender of an administrator may give emphasis to the perception of teachers because of preconceived notions of gender or the previous experiences of the administrators of the same or different gender.

**Nationality Profile.** The nationality profile of the respondent administrators is shown in Table 3. Majority of the respondents are White with a frequency of 6 or 60 percent. This is followed by other having a frequency of 2 or 20 percent. Completing the profile are the Asian and Black or African with a frequency of 1 or 10 percent. This implied that while most of the administrators are White, it showed diversity of nationality.

Blazar and Lagos (2021) examined the effects on the educational outcomes of students for exposure to same race or ethnicity professional staff including administrators and counselors with whom students interact less frequently and directly than with their teachers. They found out increased shares of same race or ethnicity led to increase in test scores and decreased in suspensions and absences. They also found out that exposure to other nationalities led to improve outcomes for students whether or not they are from the racial group.

**Highest Educational Attainment Profile.** Table 3 displayed the highest educational attainment profile of the administrators. Majority of the administrators had doctoral degree. Administrators with Master Degree +30 units were three (3). Only one administrator had Master Degree.

This implied that while majority of the administrators have a Doctoral degree, all of them have post-graduate degrees.

Ng and Feldman (2009) studied the effect of educational background on the performance of the administrators in their work. Their finding revealed that educational background was correlated to performance in work. Their finding was agreed with the study of Kasika (2015) which found a positive correlation between educational background and job performance. Thus, it was suggested that the higher the education becomes, the higher the performance is.

**Length of Administrative Experience Profile.** The length of administrative profile of the respondent administrators is displayed in Table 3. Majority of the length of experience profile of the respondent administrators has 6 to 10 years' experience having a frequency of 7. Eleven to 15 years of experience had a frequency of 2. Only one administrator had length of experience ranging from 1 to 5 years. This implies that majority of the respondents have more than 5 years of experience as administrator.

Education is important since it implies that someone has the specialized skills and capabilities an employer is looking for. The degree of an individual is always the opening window for employment. However, a degree alone is not enough without gaining any experience. Work experience is vital as well since it tells the prospective employers about what a person can contribute for the success of the organization or institution. Work experience may also provide a good match for a certain job (Mueller, 2020).

### Extent of the Attitudes of Educators in General Education

This part shows the extent of the attitudes of educators towards the inclusion of students with mild

to moderate disabilities in their classrooms. The respondent groups were surveyed and asked questions on their perception on inclusion concerning student background, peer support, administrative support, collaboration, and training.

**Student Background.** It refers to the information of the students. It determines the perception of the teachers as to the different qualities and assessment given to learners with mild to moderate abilities.

Table 4 reveals the extent of the attitudes of educators towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities in their classrooms in terms of student background. For administrators, the composite mean is 2.54 which means "Agree". For SpEd teachers, the composite mean is 2.44 which means "Disagree". For general education teachers, the composite mean is 2.48 which means "Disagree".

**Table 4 Student Background**

Indicators	Administrators		SPED Teachers		General Education Teachers	
	WM	Des	WM	Des	WM	Des
1	2.20	D	2.40	D	2.30	D
2	2.60	A	2.60	A	2.53	A
3	3.70	SA	3.40	SA	3.21	A
4	3.00	A	3.10	A	3.03	A
5	2.60	A	2.20	D	2.49	D
6	2.20	D	1.80	D	2.18	D
7	2.00	D	1.90	D	1.96	D
8	2.20	D	2.10	D	2.30	D
9	1.80	D	1.90	D	1.94	D
10	3.10	A	3.00	A	2.81	A
Ave.	2.54	A	2.44	D	2.48	D

For item-5 (Students who are verbally aggressive towards others can be maintained in regular education classrooms.), administrators agree with this while the SpEd teachers and general education teachers disagree. For the rest of the indicators, administrators, SpEd teachers and general education teachers have the same perception on the extent of the attitudes towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities in their classrooms.

The result implies that when it comes to students with disability, all three (3) respondent groups agree that students with IEP may be educated in a regular classroom. But when students are verbally abusive to others, the teachers believe that they cannot be maintained in the regular classroom. However, the administrators have an opposite view.

According to Fakolade et al. (2009), attitude is everything in terms of learning. It refers to the perception or response of an individual towards anything that comes to his or her way. Thus, it is

significant to display a positive disposition or perception towards students with disabilities or with special needs in relation to inclusive education.

**Peer Support.** It refers to the colleagues of teachers whether in general education or special education who gives aid to teachers while in the process of inclusive education to cater the needs of both regular students and those with mild to moderate disabilities.

Table 5 revealed the extent of the attitudes of educators towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities in their classrooms in terms of peer support. Administrators and Special Education teachers had the same weighted mean of 3.20 which means agree. It is the same for general education teachers which had a weighted mean of 3.06 with a description of agree.

**Table 5 Peer Support**

Indicators	Administrators		SPED Teachers		General Education Teachers	
	WM	Des	WM	Des	WM	Des
1	3.40	SA	3.30	SA	3.20	A
2	3.40	SA	3.40	SA	3.26	SA
3	3.10	A	3.50	SA	3.31	SA
4	3.30	SA	3.40	SA	3.28	SA
5	2.80	A	2.40	D	2.25	D
Ave.	3.20	A	3.20	A	3.06	A

For item-5 (My colleagues will try to place all of their special needs students in my classroom if I start including students with an IEP in my regular classroom.), administrators agree with this while the SpEd teachers and general education teachers disagree. For the rest of the indicators, administrators, SpEd teachers and general education teachers have the same perception on the extent of the attitudes towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities in their classrooms. This implies that the administrators believe that once a teacher lets students with IEP in to his/her classroom, that teacher will get more students with disability. The teachers disagree with this view.

Cooperative learning refers to frequent involvement in terms of helping and tutoring, careful listening to the views of others, encouraging and recognizing the colleague's parts in the organization, avoidance of blaming others or putting down, willingness to accept compromise in dealing with differences of thoughts and opinions. These things help in success of inclusive education. Support from teammates or colleagues enhances sense of belonging, willingness to try new and difficult tasks, and increased expression of optimism with hope regarding the group's success (Strebe, 2017).

**Administrative Support.** This is the aid in any form given by the administrators in the school to help teachers in teaching students with mild to moderate disabilities.

Table 6 revealed the extent of the attitudes of educators towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities in their classrooms in terms of administrative support. Administrators and Special Education teachers both agree with a composite mean of 3.04 and 2.76 respectively. For general education teachers, the composite mean is 2.39 with a description of disagree.

**Table 6 Administrative Support**

Indicators	Administrators		SPED Teachers		General Education Teachers	
	WM	Des	WM	Des	WM	Des
1	3.30	SA	2.70	A	2.30	D
2	3.50	SA	2.80	A	2.66	A
3	3.10	A	2.90	A	2.53	A
4	3.20	A	2.70	A	2.45	D
5	2.50	D	2.80	A	2.21	D
6	3.00	A	3.00	A	2.48	D
7	3.40	SA	2.70	A	2.46	D
8	2.30	D	2.50	S	2.05	D
Ave.	3.04	A	2.76	A	2.39	D

Table 6 displayed the Administrative support given to teachers by the administrators in inclusive education. Indicator 8 showed a description of Disagree in relation to monetary support for workshops as depicted by Administrators, SPED Teachers, and General Education Teachers. There was strong agreement by the administrators in indicators 1, 2, and 7 while SPED teachers gave an agreement to it. However, General education teachers disagreed with the three mentioned indicators.

For the rest of the indicators, administrators, SpEd teachers and general education teachers have the same perception on the extent of the attitudes towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities in their classrooms. The result implied that administrative support is only felt by the special education teachers, but not by the general education teachers.

Betoret (2006) inferred that teachers feel support by the administrators when the administration is there to help them. This help can be manifested by the building principal implementing proper student discipline and supporting the teachers when students are misbehaving in the classrooms. An administrator or principal who supports the teachers will work with the teacher and strictly enforce school rules so that students do not harm a proper classroom environment.

**Collaboration.** This is the joint force of general education and special education teachers in the inclusive education teaching students with mild to moderate disabilities and regular students.

Table 7 revealed the extent of the attitudes of educators towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities in their classrooms in terms of collaboration. Administrators, SpEd teachers and general education teachers agree with a composite mean of 2.62, 2.60 and 2.67 respectively.

**Table 7 Collaboration**

Indicators	Administrators		SPED Teachers		General Education Teachers	
	WM	Des	WM	Des	WM	Des
1	3.50	SA	3.20	A	3.16	A
2	3.50	SA	3.20	A	3.30	SA
3	3.40	SA	3.10	A	3.33	SA
4	2.60	A	3.30	SA	2.69	A
5	1.50	SA	1.60	SA	1.98	D
6	2.40	D	2.40	D	2.60	A
7	1.50	SA	2.00	D	2.10	D
8	3.70	SA	2.90	A	3.19	A
9	1.50	S	1.70	SA	1.69	SD
Ave.	2.62	A	2.60	A	2.67	A

For item-6 (I like being the only teacher in the classroom.), administrators and SpEd teachers disagree with this while the general education teachers agree. For the rest of the indicators, administrators, SpEd teachers and general education teachers have the same perception on the extent of the attitudes towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities in their classrooms. This implies that the general education teacher likes it better to work alone in the classroom rather than with a co-teacher.

According to Kritikos and Birnbaum (2003), collaboration means co-equal professionals. It unites general education and special education teachers in a process offering ongoing opportunities for the team members to share their knowledge and skills together with strategies in order to facilitate learning.

**Training.** This pertains to the activities may be in workshops or seminars that General Education and Special Education teachers take to become flexible in the process of inclusive education.

Table 8 reveals the extent of the attitudes of educators towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities in their classrooms in terms of

training. Administrators and general education teachers both agree with a composite mean of 3.11 and 2.84 respectively. For SpEd teachers, the composite mean is 2.84 which means agree.

**Table 8 Training**

Indicators	Administrators		SPED Teachers		General Education Teachers	
	WM	Des	WM	Des	WM	Des
1	3.40	SA	2.39	D	3.30	SA
2	3.20	A	2.65	A	2.60	A
3	2.60	A	2.05	D	2.20	D
4	3.10	A	2.41	D	3.00	A
5	3.10	A	2.45	D	2.90	A
6	2.70	S	2.11	D	2.70	A
7	3.10	A	2.66	A	3.00	A
8	2.90	A	2.19	D	2.70	A
9	3.40	SA	3.35	SA	3.20	A
10	3.60	SA	2.45	D	2.80	A
Ave.	3.11	A	2.47	D	2.84	A

Indicator 1 had been strongly agreed by both the Administrators and General Education Teachers. However, SPED teachers disagreed with the statement in indicator 1. SPED teachers had a description of Disagree on most of the indicators such as 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 10. General Education teachers mostly agreed with the indicators except for indicator 3 described as Disagree.

For the rest of the indicators, administrators, SpEd teachers and general education teachers have the same perception on the extent of the attitudes towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities in their classrooms. This implies that in terms of training, the teachers need more tools to effectively deal with students with disabilities.

Naicker (2006) suggested that teachers need to be trained and retrained such as in-service trainings to have a successful inclusive classroom implementation for the benefit of the students. Westwood (2017) added that trainings are much useful to be an effective teacher especially if the training does not majorly focus on academic knowledge only but also in acquisition of skills as well.

**Delivery Method for Training**

This part of the chapter shows the respondent group’s preference as to how training should be delivered. They were asked to rank given options as to which to them is most beneficial.



**Table 9 Delivery Method for Training**

Delivery Method	Administrators		Teachers	
	WM	Rank	WM	Rank
District Level In-Service Training	2.50	2	2.78	3
Out of District Training	4.60	5	4.03	4
Coursework at College/University	4.90	6	5.41	7
School Building Level Training	2.20	1	2.61	1
Article(s) provided to you	5.60	7	5.39	6
Time for Consultation with School Psychologist	4.10	3.5	5.02	5

Table 9 reveals the type of delivery method that is beneficial in receiving training on including special education students in the classroom as to the perception of the administrators' and teachers' respondents. For administrators' respondents, school building level training ranks first. This is followed by district level in-service training. Tie in the next rank is time for consultation with school psychologist and special education teachers. On the fifth rank is out of district training. Completing the list are coursework at college or university and articles(s) provided.

Administrators' respondents listed some other methods of training delivery that they believe would be helpful in receiving information on inclusive education. They are professional development seminars and activities provided by private organizations authorized by the State Education Department to hold these activities, remediation and tutorials after classes, current trends in Special Education and life skills training. There should be training on working as a team, being organized at the being of school, and support from the top down. One on one work with special education teachers to consult about Special Education students in the general classroom setting.

For the possible topics that the administrators' respondents suggested, they are classroom management with inclusive education and special education teacher's role in general education settings.

For teachers' respondents, school building level training ranks first which is the same with the administrators. This is followed by time for consultation with special education teachers. Third in the rank is district level in-service training, and then out of district training. On the fifth rank is time for consultation with school psychologist. Completing

the list are articles(s) provided and coursework at college or university.

Teachers' respondents listed some other methods of training delivery that they believe would be helpful in receiving information on inclusive education. They are online trainings for specific disabilities and co-teaching models, shadowing SpEd teachers in their classrooms and international trainings and symposium. They also listed live demonstrations like a specialist takes over their classroom for one or two days and allows them to see how they apply the information from the training. Added on the list is the online learning methods or platforms on which for them is a great opportunity to share in discussion like canvas, one on one training with special education instructors. They also suggested that administrators need to be trained as knowing the IEP process would be helpful. In sum, the data implies that both administrators and teachers prefer to get training at school building level, among other options.

For the possible topics that the teachers' respondents suggested, they are differentiated instruction, behavior's plans and modification, classroom management with inclusive education on which this is also listed in the administrators' suggested topics.

The European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (2011) emphasized that teachers and administrators should receive sufficient training to make sure that they remain focused in providing real learning opportunities for all children and not just for students to participate in and be judged by high stake assessments which have little meaning for them. Thus, it is important to understand the type of training that is needed for teachers to be more equipped in inclusive education.

### Test of Significant Difference

This part of the chapter shows the significant difference on the attitudes of educators in general education towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities among the ratings of three respondent groups.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was considered to gauge the significant difference on the attitudes of educators in general education towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities among the ratings of three respondent groups.

Table 10 displays the significant difference on the attitudes of educators in general education towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities among the ratings of three respondent groups.

**Table 10 Test of Significant Difference**

Areas	df	F computed value	F Critical Value	Decision	Remarks
Student Background	97	0.60	3.09	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not Significant
Peer Support	97	1.13	3.09	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Insignificant
Administrative Support	97	4.47	3.09	Reject H <sub>0</sub>	Significant
Collaboration	97	2.13	3.09	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not Significant
Training	97	4.05	3.09	Reject H <sub>0</sub>	Significant

For the student background, peer support and collaboration, the computed values are lesser than the set critical value of 3.09. At 0.05 significance level, the decision is to accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis. Null hypothesis states that there is no significant difference on the attitudes of educators in general education towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities among the ratings of three respondent groups.

For the administrative support and training, the computed value is greater than the set critical value of 3.09. At 0.05 significance level, the decision is to accept the alternative hypothesis and reject the null hypothesis. Alternative hypothesis states that there is a significant difference on the attitudes of educators in general education towards the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities among the ratings of three respondent groups. The implication of these results is that the general education teachers do not mind the other subdomains on the learning conditions of the students, or whether they have support from their colleagues, as long as they are supported by their administrators to get more trainings that they feel they need to be able to give instructions on students with disabilities in their classrooms.

### Test of Significant Correlation

This part of the chapter shows the significant correlation between the general education teachers' attitudes towards inclusion and each of their demographic profiles. Chi-square was considered to test the significant correlation of the two identified variables as both of them are in categorical form.

Table 11 manifests the relationship between the general education teachers' perceptions and their demographic profiles. From the results reflected in the table, the computed values are lesser than the critical value.

**Table 11. Test of Significant Correlation**

Variables	X <sup>2</sup>	Cramer's V-Value	P-value	Decision	Interpretation
Teachers' Perceptions and age	23.45	0.342	0.001	Reject H <sub>0</sub>	Significant
Teachers' Perceptions and gender	1.9	0.151	0.37	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not Significant
Teachers' Perceptions and educational level	20.61	0.393	0.008	Reject H <sub>0</sub>	Significant
Teachers' Perceptions and race	16.93	0.356	0.075	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not Significant

Alpha: 0.05

At 0.05 significance level, the decision is to accept the null hypothesis as to gender and race, and reject the null hypothesis age and educational level. Null hypothesis states that there is no correlation on the general education teachers' attitudes towards inclusion and their identified demographic profiles (age, gender, nationality, highest educational attainment and length of teaching experience). This indicates that the demographic profile of the general education teachers as to age and educational level are not substantial as to their perspective towards inclusion. However, the subject of gender and race are significant as to their perception towards inclusion.

### CONCLUSION

Based from the findings of the study, the teachers and administrators mostly approve the inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities. Also, the administrative support and training are significantly different on the attitudes of educators in general education towards the inclusion of students with mild and moderate disabilities since teachers provide less concerns on the other subdomains on the learning conditions of the students.

### RECOMMENDATION

Having regard to the findings and conclusions generated in this study, it is recommended schools should conduct professional development training to enhance educator's perspectives towards inclusion of students with mild to moderate disabilities into the general education classroom.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- [1] Avramidis, E. & Kalyva, E. (2007). The Influence of Teaching Experience and Professional Development on Greek Teachers' Attitudes towards Inclusion. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*.
- [2] Avramidis, E., & Norwich, B. (2002). Teachers' Attitudes towards Integration/Inclusion: A Review of the Literature. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*.
- [3] Bell, C. M. (2011). *Blackness and Disability: Critical Examinations and Cultural Interventions*. LIT Verlag Munster.
- [4] Betoret, F. (2006). Stressors, Self-Efficacy, Coping Resources, and Burnout among Secondary School Teachers in Spain. *Educational Psychology*.
- [5] Blazar, D. & Lagos, F. (2021). Professional Staff Diversity and Student Outcomes: Extending our Understanding of Race/Ethnicity-Matching Effects in Education. Annenberg Institute at Brown University.
- [6] Bodhe, C. D. & Jankar, D. S. (2015). Teaching Effectiveness: How Do Students Evaluate their Teacher? *International J. of Healthcare and Biomedical Research*, Vol. 63.
- [7] Bryant, F. B., Kastrup, H., Udo, M., Hislop, N., Shefner, R. & Mallow, J. (2013). Science Anxiety, Science Attitudes, and Constructivism: A Binational Study. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*.
- [8] Carter, N., Prater, M., Jackson, A., & Marchant, M. (2009). Educators' Perceptions of Collaborative Planning Processes for Students with Disabilities. *Preventing School Failure*.
- [9] Causton, J., & Tracy-Bronson, C. P. (2015). *The Educator's Handbook for Inclusive School Practices*. Paul H. Brookes Publishing Company.
- [10] Charley, C. Y. (2015). *General Education and Special Education Teachers' Attitudes toward Inclusion*. Walden University.
- [11] Dev, P., & Haynes, L. (2015). Teacher Perspectives on Suitable Learning Environments for Students with Disabilities: What Have We Learned from Inclusive, Resource, and Self-Contained Classrooms? *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*.
- [12] European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (2011). *Teacher Education for Inclusive Across Europe-Challenges and Opportunities*. Odense, Denmark.
- [13] Fakolade, O. A., Adeniyi, S. O. & Tella, A. (2009). Attitude of Teachers towards the Inclusion of Special Needs Children in General Education Classroom: The Case of Teachers in Some Selected Schools in Nigeria. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*.
- [14] Feldman, K. A. (1993). College Student's Views of Male and Female College Teachers. Student's Evaluations of their Classroom Teachers Research in Higher Education.
- [15] Foot, K. (2014). *Cultural-Historical Activity Theory: Exploring a Theory to Inform Practice and Research*. Department of Communication, University of Washington.
- [16] Gindis, B. (2003). Remediation through Education: Sociocultural Theory and Children with Special Needs. In: Kozulin et al. (Eds.) *Vygotsky's Educational Theory in Cultural Context* Cambridge University Press.
- [17] Greenberg, E., Rhodes, D. Ye, X., & Stancavage, F. (2004). Prepared to Teach: Teacher Preparation and Student Achievement in Eighth-Grade Mathematics. American Institute for Research.
- [18] Haq, F. S., & Mundia, L. (2012). Comparison of Brunei Preservice Student Teachers' Attitudes to Inclusive Education and Specific Disabilities: Implications for Teacher Education. *The Journal of Educational Research*.
- [19] Julkunen, I. (2013). Critical Examination of the Research in Practice and the Development of Social Services in HUSK: A Practice Research Perspective. University of California, Berkeley.
- [20] Karpov, J. (2005). *The Neo-Vygotskian Approach to Child Development*. Cambridge University Press.
- [21] Kasika, B. D. (2015). The Effect of Educational Qualification on Job Performance: The Case of Social Security Commission in Namibia. University of Namibia.
- [22] Kosko, K. W., & Wilkins, J. L. (2009). General Educators' In-Service Training and Their Self-Perceived Ability to Adapt Instruction for Students with IEPs. *The Professional Educator*.

- [23] Kritikos, E, & Birnbaum, B. (2003). General Education and Special Education Teachers' Beliefs Regarding Collaboration. *Learning Disabilities: A Multidisciplinary Journal*.
- [24] Markus, H. R. (2008). Pride, Prejudice, and Ambivalence: Toward a Unified Theory of Race and Ethnicity. *American Psychologist*.
- [25] Medaris, M. (1998). Guide to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.
- [26] Mueller, A. (2020). Education Vs. Experience: Which One Gets the Job? Toppel Career Center.
- [27] Naicker, L, (2006). What Really Works in Special and Inclusive Education: Using Evidence-Based Teacher Strategies. New York, NY: Rutledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- [28] Ng, T. WH. & Feldman, D. C. (2009). How Broadly Does Education Contribute to Job Performance? *Personnel Psychology*.
- [29] Parres, R. L. (2020). Educator's Perspectives Regarding the Inclusion of Students with Mild to Moderate Disabilities into the General Education Classroom. California State University, San Bernardino.
- [30] Patrick, S., Worthen, M., Frost, D., & Gentz, S. (2016). Meeting Every Student Succeeds Act's Promise: State Policy to Support Personalized Learning. The Mission of the International Association for K-12 Online Learning.
- [31] Rakap, S., & Kaczmarek, L. (2010). Teacher's Attitudes towards Inclusion in Turkey. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*.
- [32] Rodina, K. (2006). The Impact of Vygotsky '5 Cultural-Historical Concept of Disability in Inclusive Preschool Education in Russia.
- [33] Sari, H., Celikoz, N. & Secer, Z. (2009). An Analysis of Pre-School Teachers and Student Teachers' Attitudes to Inclusion and Their Self-Efficacy. *International Journal of Special Education*.
- [34] Stigliano, K. (2021). The Teacher Viewpoint: How Administrator Gender Impacts Teachers' Perception of Effective Building Leadership. Seton Hill University.
- [35] Strebe, J. (2017). Engaging Students Using Cooperative Learning. New York, NY: Routledge.
- [36] Szumski, G., Smogorzewska, J., & Karwowski, M. (2017). Academic Achievement of Students without Special Educational Needs in Inclusive Classrooms: A Meta-analysis. *Education Research Review*.
- [37] Ukpong, E. M. (2000). The Psychology of Adult Learning. Port Harcourt, Double Diamond Publishers.
- [38] Wenglinsky, H. (2002). The Link Between Teacher Classroom Practices and Student Academic Performance. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*.
- [39] Westwood, Y. (2017). Researching Social Inequalities in Education: Towards a Bourdieunian Methodology. *Int. J. Qualitat. Stud. Educ.*
- [40] Young, S. & Rush, L. (2009). Evaluating Gender Bias in Ratings of University Instructors' Teaching Effectiveness. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*.